## OPEN MEETING ITEM

Control of the Contro



interim Executive Director

92

# COMMISSIONERS KRISTIN K. MAYES – Chairman GARY PIERCE PAUL NEWMAN SANDRA D. KENNEDY BOB STUMP

#### **ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**

ORIGINAL.

DATE:

JULY 1, 2009

DOCKET NO:

T-20611A-08-0405

Arizona Corporation Commission DOCKETED

JUL - 1 2009

DOCKETED BY

#### TO ALL PARTIES:

Enclosed please find the recommendation of Administrative Law Judge Belinda A. Martin. The recommendation has been filed in the form of an Order on:

## RELIANCE COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. (CC&N/RESELLER)

Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-3-110(B), you may file exceptions to the recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge by filing an original and thirteen (13) copies of the exceptions with the Commission's Docket Control at the address listed below by 4:00 p.m. on or before:

JULY 10, 2009

The enclosed is <u>NOT</u> an order of the Commission, but a recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge to the Commissioners. Consideration of this matter has <u>tentatively</u> been scheduled for the Commission's Open Meeting to be held on:

JULY 28, 2009 and JULY 29, 2009

For more information, you may contact Docket Control at (602)542-3477 or the Hearing Division at (602)542-4250. For information about the Open Meeting, contact the Executive Director's Office at (602) 542-3931.

RECEIVED

2001 JUL - 1 A 10: 48

AZ CORP COMMESSION

DOCKET CONTROL

MICHAEL P. KEÁRNS

INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

1200 WEST WASHINGTON STREET; PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007-2927 / 400 WEST CONGRESS STREET; TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701-1347 WWW.AZCC.GOV

1	BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION		
2	COMMISSIONERS		
3 4 5 6	KRISTIN K. MAYES, Chairman GARY PIERCE PAUL NEWMAN SANDRA D. KENNEDY BOB STUMP		
7 8 9	IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF RELIANCE COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC. FOR A CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY TO PROVIDE RESOLD LONG DISTANCE TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES.  DOCKET NO. T-20611A-08-0405  DECISION NO.  ORDER		
11 12	Open Meeting July 28 and 29, 2009 Phoenix, Arizona		
13	BY THE COMMISSION:		
14	* * * * * * * *		
15	Having considered the entire record herein and being fully advised in the premises, the		
16	Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") finds, concludes, and orders that:		
17	FINDINGS OF FACT		
18	1. On August 1, 2008, Reliance Communications International, Inc. ("Reliance" or		
19	"Company"), filed with the Commission an application for a Certificate of Convenience and		
20	Necessity ("CC&N") to provide competitive resold long distance telecommunications services within		
21	a service area encompassing the entire State of Arizona ("Application").		
22	2. On October 22, 2008, the Company filed its Affidavit of Publication stating that		
23	Notice of the Application was published on September 23, 2008, in the Arizona Business Gazette.		
24	3. On April 14, 2009, Reliance filed its responses to the Commission's Utilities Division		
25	Staff's ("Staff") First Set of Data Requests.		
26	4. On May 13, 2009, Staff filed its Staff Report recommending approval of Reliance's		
27	Application, subject to certain conditions.		
28			

S:\BMartin\Telecom\Reseller\Reliance.080405.doc

## 

### 

## 

## 

## 

## 

## 

## 

### Fitness and Properness to Obtain a CC&N

- 5. Reliance is a Delaware corporation, granted authority on May 27, 2004, to do business in Arizona as a foreign corporation.
  - 6. Reliance is in good standing with the Commission's Corporations Division.
- 7. Reliance does not currently hold a CC&N to provide telecommunications services in Arizona and is not providing telecommunications services in Arizona.
- 8. Reliance has indicated that neither Reliance nor any of its officers, directors, partners, or managers have been or are currently involved in any civil or criminal investigations, have had judgments entered in any civil or criminal matter or levied by any administrative or regulatory agency, nor have been convicted of any criminal acts within the past 10 years.
- 9. Reliance has indicated that neither Reliance nor any of its officers, directors, partners, or managers have been or currently are involved in any formal or informal complaint proceedings pending before any state or federal regulatory commission, administrative agency, or law enforcement agency.
- 10. Staff contacted the public utility commissions ("PUCs") in the nine states<sup>1</sup> in which Reliance asserts it is authorized to offer telecommunications services to verify that Reliance is certificated or registered to provide telecommunication services, and to inquire as to consumer complaints. According to Staff, none of the PUCs contacted reported any complaints against the Company.

## **Technical Capabilities**

- 11. Reliance intends to offer resold long distance telecommunications services to subscribers in Arizona. The Company indicated that its plans include the provision of pre-paid and post-paid calling services purchased on its website by customers.
- 12. Reliance has authority to provide telecommunications services in nine states, but has not begun providing service.
  - 13. Reliance's four key management personnel have more than 73 years combined

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Reliance is authorized to provide telecommunications services in Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Montana, New York, and Texas.

3

4

5

6

7 8

10

9

12

11

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

experience in the telecommunications communications industry.

14. Staff has determined that Reliance has sufficient technical capabilities to provide resold long distance telecommunications services in Arizona.

#### Financial Resources

- 15. Reliance provided audited financial statements for the 12-month period ending March 31, 2008. The financial statement for this period lists total assets of \$25,817,361, total equity of \$3.836.342, and net income of \$1,914,398. The Company also provided financial statements for the 12-month period ending March 31, 2007. The financial statement for this period lists total assets of \$19,595,402, total equity of \$1,921,944, and net income of \$1,869,290.
- 16. The Company notes that, if necessary, it will rely on the financial resources of its parent company, Reliance Communications, Inc.
- Reliance projects total revenues generated by the provision of telecommunications 17. services to Arizona customers for the first 12 months of operations to be \$204,500, with operating expenses during that period of \$19,300.
- 18. Reliance projects the net book value of all Arizona jurisdictional assets and the projected value of all Arizona assets after the first 12 months of operations to be zero.
- 19. Staff stated that Reliance's experiencing financial difficulty would have only a minimal impact on its customers because many companies provide resold long distance telecommunications services, and facilities-based providers are also available.

### **Proposed Rates**

- 20. Staff indicates that the rates proposed by Reliance are for competitive services and rates for competitive telecommunications services are generally not established according to rate-ofreturn regulation.
- Staff has determined that Reliance's fair value rate base ("FVRB") is zero. While 21. Staff considered the FVRB information submitted by Reliance, Staff determined that the FVRB information should not be given substantial weight in its analysis.
- As a reseller of services purchased from other telecommunications companies, 22. Reliance will have no market power and will have to compete with other providers to obtain

6

5

7 8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

subscribers to its services. In light of this competitive market, Staff believes that Reliance's proposed tariffs will be just and reasonable.

- 23. Staff has reviewed Reliance's proposed rates and determined that they are just and reasonable.
- 24. Reliance's tariff indicates that it will not collect advance payments or deposits from its resold long distance customers. However, Reliance's will utilize pre-paid calling services purchased on its website by its customers. As such, in order to protect Arizona customers, Staff recommends that Reliance be required to provide either a performance bond or irrevocable sight draft letter of credit in the amount of \$10,000.

#### Regulatory Requirements

- 25. Commission rules require Reliance to file a tariff for each competitive service that states the maximum rate as well as the effective (actual) price that will be charged for the service. Under Arizona Administrative Code ("A.A.C.") R14-2-1109(A), the minimum rate for a service must not be below the total service long-run incremental cost of providing the service. Any change to Reliance's effective price for a service must comply with A.A.C. R14-2-1109, and any change to the maximum rate for a service in Reliance's tariff must comply with A.A.C. R14-2-1110.
- 26. A.A.C. R14-2-1204(A) requires all telecommunications service providers that interconnect to the public switched network to provide funding for the Arizona Universal Service Fund ("AUSF"). A.A.C. R14-2-1204(B)(3)(a) requires new telecommunications service providers that begin providing toll service after April 26, 1996, to pay AUSF charges as provided under A.A.C. R14-2-1204(B)(2).
- 27. A.A.C. R14-2-1901 et seq. establish requirements to protect Arizona consumers from unauthorized carrier changes ("slamming") and apply to each public service corporation providing telecommunications services within the State of Arizona and over which the Commission has jurisdiction.
- 28. A.A.C. R14-2-2001 et seq. establish requirements to protect Arizona consumers from unauthorized carrier charges ("cramming") and apply to each public service corporation providing telecommunications services within the State of Arizona and over which the Commission has

jurisdiction.

29. A.A.C. R14-2-1107 requires a competitive telecommunications service provider to file an application for authorization with the Commission before it discontinues service; the rule also establishes customer notice requirements and other requirements related to discontinuance of service.

### **Competitive Services**

30. Staff states that there are alternatives to Reliance's services, the Company will have to convince potential customers to purchase its services, and the Company has no ability to adversely affect the interexchange service markets. As such, Staff recommends that the Company's proposed services be classified as competitive.

### Staff's Recommendations

- 31. Staff recommends approval of Reliance's Application and further recommends:
  - a. That Reliance be ordered to comply with all Commission rules, orders, and other requirements relevant to the provision of intrastate telecommunications service;
  - b. That Reliance be ordered to maintain its accounts and records as required by the Commission;
  - c. That Reliance be ordered to file with the Commission all financial and other reports that the Commission may require, in a form and at such times as the Commission may designate;
  - d. That Reliance be ordered to maintain on file with the Commission all current tariffs and rates and any service standards that the Commission may require;
  - e. That Reliance be ordered to comply with the Commission's rules and to modify its tariffs to conform to those rules if it is determined that there is a conflict between Reliance's tariffs and Commission rules:
  - f. That Reliance be ordered to cooperate with Commission investigations, including but not limited to customer complaints;
  - g. That Reliance be ordered to participate in and contribute to the AUSF as required by the Commission;
  - h. That Reliance be ordered to notify the Commission immediately upon changes to its name, address, or telephone number;

- i. That Reliance's intrastate interexchange service offerings be classified as competitive pursuant to A.A.C. R14-2-1108;
- j. That the maximum rates for Reliance's services be the maximum rates proposed by Reliance in its proposed tariffs;
- k. That the minimum rates for Reliance's services be the total service long-run incremental costs of providing those services, as set forth in A.A.C. R14-2-1109;
- 1. If Reliance states only one rate for a service in its proposed tariff, that the rate stated be the effective (actual) price to be charged for the service as well as the service's maximum rate;
- m. That Reliance's FVRB is zero;
- n. That should Reliance request to discontinue and/or abandon its service area, Reliance must provide notice to both the Commission and its customers, in accordance with A.A.C. R-14-2-1107; and
- o. That Reliance be ordered to do the following and that its CC&N be rendered null and void, after due process, if it fails to do the following:
  - i. Reliance shall docket conforming tariffs for each service within its CC&N within 365 days from the date of an Order in this matter or 30 days before providing service, whichever comes first.
  - ii. Reliance shall procure either a performance bond or an irrevocable sight draft letter of credit equal to \$10,000.
  - iii. Reliance shall docket proof of the original performance bond or irrevocable sight draft letter of credit with the Commission's Business Office and copies of the performance bond or irrevocable sight draft letter of credit with Docket Control, as a compliance item in this docket, within 30 days of the effective date of a Decision in this matter. The performance bond or irrevocable sight draft letter of credit must remain in effect until further order of the Commission. Commission may draw on the performance bond or irrevocable sight draft letter of credit, on behalf of, and for the sole benefit of, the Company's customers, if the Commission finds, in its discretion, that the Company is in default of its obligations arising from its Certificate. The Commission may use the performance bond or irrevocable sight draft letter of credit funds, as appropriate, to protect the Company's customers and public interest and take any and all actions the Commission deems necessary, in its discretion, including, but not limited to, returning prepayments or deposits collected from the Company's customers.

5 6

7 8

10

1112

13<sup>1</sup>

15

16 17

18

19

2021

22

2324

25

26

2728

32. Staff's recommendations are reasonable and should be adopted.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

- 1. Upon receiving a CC&N, Reliance will be a public service corporation within the meaning of Article XV of the Arizona Constitution and A.R.S. §§ 40-281 and 40-282.
- 2. The Commission has jurisdiction over Reliance and the subject matter of the Application.
- 3. A.R.S. § 40-282 allows a telecommunications company to file an application for a CC&N to provide competitive telecommunications services.
- 4. A.R.S. § 40-282 allows the Commission to grant a CC&N without first conducting a hearing if the CC&N is for resold telecommunications services.
  - 5. Notice of Reliance's Application was given in accordance with Arizona law.
- 6. Pursuant to Article XV of the Arizona Constitution and the Arizona Revised Statutes, it is in the public interest for Reliance to provide the telecommunications services for which it has requested authorization in its Application.
- 7. Reliance is a fit and proper entity to receive a CC&N authorizing it to provide resold long distance telecommunications services in the State of Arizona.
- 8. The telecommunications services that Reliance desires to provide are competitive in Arizona.
- 9. Pursuant to Article XV of the Arizona Constitution and 14 A.A.C. 2, Article 11, it is just and reasonable and in the public interest for Reliance to establish rates and charges for competitive services that are not less than Reliance's total service long-run incremental costs of providing the competitive services approved herein.
- 10. Staff's recommendations, as set forth in Findings of Fact No. 31, are reasonable and should be adopted.
- 11. Reliance's fair value rate base is not useful in determining just and reasonable rates for the competitive services it proposes to provide Arizona customers.
- 12. Reliance's rates, as they appear in its proposed tariffs, are just and reasonable and should be approved.

1 **ORDER** IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Application of Reliance Communications 2 International, Inc., for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity to provide competitive resold long 3 distance telecommunications services in Arizona is hereby granted conditioned upon compliance with 4 5 conditions set forth in Findings of Fact No. 31. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if Reliance Communications International, Inc., fails to 6 meet the conditions outlined in Findings of Fact No. 31(o) within the timeframes stated therein, the 7 Certificate of Convenience and Necessity conditionally granted herein shall become null and void 8 9 after due process. 10 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Decision shall become effective immediately. 11 BY ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION. 12 13 **CHAIRMAN** 14 COMMISSIONER 15 COMMISSIONER 16 COMMISSIONER COMMISSIONER 17 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, MICHAEL P. KEARNS, Interim 18 Executive Director of the Arizona Corporation Commission, have hereunto set my hand and caused the official seal of the 19 Commission to be affixed at the Capitol, in the City of Phoenix. this day of 2009. 20 21 22 MICHAEL P. KEARNS 23 INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR 24 25 DISSENT 26 27 DISSENT 28

1	SERVICE LIST FOR:	RELIANCE COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC.	
2		in Edwin Civil, inc.	
3	DOCKET NO.:	T-20611A-08-0405	
4	Siddharth Kothari		
5	RELIANCE COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL, INC.		
6	570 Lexington Avenue, 38 <sup>th</sup> Floor New York, NY 10022		
7	Joshua Guyan, Esq.		
8	SQUIRE SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P. 1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Suite 500		
9	Washington, D.C. 20004		
10	Janice Alward, Chief Counsel Legal Division		
11	ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSIO 1200 West Washington Street	N	
12	Phoenix, AZ 85007		
13	Ernest G. Johnson, Director Utilities Division		
14	ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 1200 West Washington Street		
15	Phoenix, AZ 85007		
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
~~			

Q